

Application number 08/993,442  
Amendment dated July 2, 2003  
Reply to office action mailed February 3, 2003

PATENT

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

After entry of this amendment, claims 1, 3, 10-20, and 23-30 will be pending in this application. Claims 1, 10, 20, and 23-26 have been amended. Claim 26 has been amended to correct its dependency. Claims 27-30 have been added. Support for the new and amended claims can be found in the specification. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 3, 10-18 and 23-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamauchi et al. "Architecture and Implementation of a Highly Parallel Single-Chip Video DSP." Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamauchi et al. Reconsideration of these rejections and allowance of all the pending claims in light of these remarks and amendments is respectfully requested.

Claim 1

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamauchi et al. (Yamauchi) But Yamauchi does not teach each and every element of this claim. For example, claim 1, as amended, recites "a shared output and feedback interface coupled to receive the first result from the first MAC unit and the second result from the second MAC unit, and further coupled to provide the first and second results to the first and second local memories." Yamauchi does not provide this feature.

The pending office action cites Figure 2 of Yamauchi as teaching each and every element of this claim. (See pending office mailed February 3, 2003, page 3, section 5.) But Applicant submits that no such shared output and feedback interface is shown in this figure.

A shared output and feedback interface as provided by the claim provides an efficient way in which to calculate  $X=(az+b)/(cz+d)$ , where a, b, c, d, and z are complex floating point numbers, a common calculation in frame rendering. (See pending application, page 17, lines 12-36.) Yamauchi does not provide this feature in this manner.

For at least this reason, claim 1 should be allowed.

Application number 08/993,442  
Amendment dated July 2, 2003  
Reply to office action mailed February 3, 2003

PATENT

Other claims

Claim 3 depends on claim 1, and should be allowed for the same reason, and for the additional limitations it recites.

Claim 10 should be allowed for similar reasons as claim 1.

Claims 11-20 depend on claim 10, and should be allowed for similar reasons as claim 10, and for the additional limitations they recite.

Claims 23 and 25 should be allowed for similar reasons as claim 1.

Claims 24 and 26 depend on claims 23 and 25, and should be allowed for similar reasons as claims 23 and 25, and for the additional limitations they recite.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal notice of allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,



J. Matthew Zigmant  
Reg. No. 44,005

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, 8<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 650-326-2400  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
JMZ:jmz  
PA 3316392 v1